

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
STATEWIDE COUNCIL FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE
REGIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

May 21, 2018
10:00 A.M.

MEETING LOCATIONS:

The meeting was video conferenced from both locations

Office	Address	City	Meeting Room
Department of Education	9890 S. Maryland Pkwy	Las, Vegas	Board Room (2 nd Floor)
Department of Education	700 E. Fifth St	Carson City	Board Room

SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING

DEPARTMENT STAFF PRESENT:

Dena Durish
Kathleen Galland-Collins
KellyLynn Charles
Sylvia Figueroa

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Las Vegas:

Jeff Zander
Dr. Wendi Hawk
Brent Husson
Debbie Brockett

Carson City:

Aaron Grossman

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

Las Vegas:

Chelli Smith
Sarah Negrete
Meredith Smith

Carson City:

Kirsten Gleissner
Sondra Neudauer

1. Call to Order; Roll Call: Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Zander called meeting to order at 10:14 AM.

Roll call was taken and is reflected above. It was determined that quorum was met.

2. Public Comment #1

No public comment in Carson.

No public comment in Las Vegas.

3. Flexible Agenda Approval (*Discussion/For Possible Action*)

Motion: Member Hawk made a motion to approve for a flexible agenda.

Member Husson seconded the motion.

All in favor

Motion carried unanimously 10:15 AM

4. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes for April 30, 2018

Motion: Member Husson moved to approve the January 26, 2018 meeting minutes

Member Brocket seconded the motion

All in favor

Motion carried unanimously 10:15 AM

5. Member Update

Discussed length of term limit. Member Wendi Hawk and Debbie Brockett were both on the original board and asked if they have out served their term. Chair Zander and Sandra Sheldon are to retire this year. Pam Teel will continue to represent SNRPDP on this board next year. Wayne Workman will represent the NWRPDP. Adam Young, the superintendent from White Pine, will be representing the NRPDP next year. Chair Zander looked up statute and reminded the Council that members serve a 2 year term. Chair Zander is unsure how Member Hawk and Member Brockett were appointed or if they were appointed by the governor. Dena Durish stated that NDE has appointment letters from the positions that were appointed by the governor. Other councils check in with members to see if they are still interested in serving when they are near the end of their term. They are to contact the governor if they wish to continue to serve or if they do not wish to continue. The next meeting will be sometime in the fall, a new chairperson will be elected at that time.

6. Nevada Department of Education Updates *(Information/Discussion)*

Members will hear updates from NDE regarding items of interest that may impact the work of the Council.

B474 update per request of the Council.

KellyLynn Charles prepared a spreadsheet on SB474 recommendations. The law stated that recommendations could be made regarding policy, legislation, regulations, and/or budget. The report was completed in January of 2017 prior to the session. A total of nineteen recommendations were made. Four of those were related to the creation of professional development standards. Twelve were either regulatory, statutory or policy. Three were related to budget. The spreadsheet outlines the status of each recommendation, actions taken, progress made, relevant NRS and NAC. This document will be used to guide the continued work of the Council.

The Council decided to do an in depth review of each of the recommendations.

Recommendation #1 a, b, and c are related to the creation and adoption of professional development standards. The standards adopted were the Learning Forward standards plus two additional standards regarding equity and cultural competency. The RPDPs have already been using the Learning Forward standards. Moving forward the only difference for them is the addition of two additional standards: equity, and cultural competency. As a result of Recommendation #1a, there were two sections in AB77 that directed the State Board of Education to adopt professional development standards. A public workshop was held and suggested language was sent to LCB for drafting. Final documentation is pending and once it is returned the proposed language will be posted for 30 days prior to the public hearing at a State Board of Education meeting. Once adopted, guidance will go out to districts and RPDPs regarding the standards.

Recommendation #3 says the school districts and RPDPs should align trainings to the adopted standards and evidenced based language from ESSA. This recommendation was included in two different bills, AB7 and AB77. Legislative Council Bureau (LCB) legal staff are in the process of updating the relevant sections of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). Pending completion, guidance would be sent out to districts and RPDPs. The next steps would be pending State Board public hearing and passage by legislative commission. Member Husson had a question and wanted to know if there was a timeline when all this should get done? Dena answered no, not in this case. Member Husson asked if any of the districts have any information on this, or are the districts operating under the old system. Dena confirmed that is correct. There was a public workshop on November 28, 2017 that had the language that was going to be proposed. Even though it hadn't been officially adopted, folks knew the expectations that would be coming.

Member Hawk asked about the possible disconnect with the ESSA based evidence for Professional Development and the tiered levels of support. Dena answered that ESSA under federal law has tiered levels of support. Tier One is the highest level of evidenced based that was demonstrated through randomized control studies. Several federal funds can only go to Tiers One, Two, and Three. Those have designated providers that have met the criteria. Tier Four provides a little flexibility. Tier Four is considered promising practices and are allowed for use of Title IIA funds for professional development, as well as a few other grant projects. RPDPs and districts would not have to demonstrate at this point Tier One, Two, or Three but would need to demonstrate Tier Four, emerging evidence. Tier Four language states “practices that have a well-defined logic model or theory of action are supported by research and have an effort underway by a school district, state agency, or outside research organization to determine effectiveness.” RPDPs constantly do the analysis of their trainings as demonstrated through their annual reports. That would qualify their work as Tier 4.

Recommendation #3 refers to the alignment of RPDPs and districts outlining professional development alignment with priorities, the Strategic Plan adopted by SBE. The idea is that when those standards are approved, all of that guidance would go out.

Recommendation #4c and #4d are related to what was previously in the law. The law previously required two things: 1) every RPDP submit an annual report and 2) every district provide a report of training provided. The recommendations from the SB474 group were then put into AB77. The actions taken in AB77 eliminated 2 reporting structures and allowed for the RPDPs to create a report. The concern was that there should be a standard format. At the September 28th meeting, the RPDP directors shared a report template. There currently are no regulations regarding that report. There have been conversations whether to formalize that or not, but it wasn't required and has not been done yet. As long as the RPDPs are in agreement, the language submitted had been approved. Starting this year (2017-2018) it would be a standardized report. Member Husson asked if districts were required to report. Dena Durish answered that #4c and #4d were the reporting of all training required by RPDPs. Previously the districts were required to report the training provided by RPDPs. The RPDPs would each submit a report and then each county that they served would submit an almost identical report with the same language. Recommendations #4c and #4d delete the need of duplicate reporting. There is still a requirement that the districts share that disaggregated information with their board of trustees and their governing boards. Member Husson asked if that meant the Council would only know about RPDP provided support. Would that be presuming that districts would not be doing anything to support their teachers outside of what RPDPs are doing? Dena Durish stated. The statute only dealt with the relationships between RPDPs and districts, other PD was never required to be reported.

Recommendation #4a states the legislature should require that school districts submit to the State Board an annual professional development report. The report should include, but not be limited to all of the other types of professional development that would be provided. There have been a lot of conversations around that and it was passed in AB77. There is not a requirement to adopt a regulatory language. There is discussion regarding whether or not we have the authority to adopt regulatory language around what the “other types of professional development” would be because it doesn't say the department should adopt regulations. It says the report “should include but not be limited to.” The guidance to districts would be to provide all of their professional development. The challenge is it is almost impossible to capture all PD. Member Husson wanted clarification on as we build this we are going to require that we hear from the RPDPs everything they are doing both in the aggregate and disaggregate, but then this body would not know about anything that is done outside of the RPDPs. Member Husson believes that the RPDPs are only one source of professional development and there wouldn't be a full picture. Member Husson believes from Recommendation #4a that the report must show all professional development that is happening. A report should come from the districts. The district's report should include what they are getting from RPDP, but it should be everything else as well. Member Husson doesn't believe there is any intention that all professional development

be provided to any one district. Dena Durish stated that some rurals have used primarily RPDPs as their source of professional development, but doesn't believe that is the case now. A lot of state wide evidence based providers are being brought in as options. Member Husson stated the regulation in Recommendation #2b says that it has to be job-embedded. By that definition, it means it could not be RPDP. Dena Durish stated that RPDPs do go out and do job-embedded. They are coaching and providing other services in the classrooms and in the schools.

Dena Durish clarifies that this is a new report that the districts should report to the state board to talk about annual professional development that is occurring across all other sources.

Chair Zander stated professional development in Clark and Washoe is different from the rurals, and the majority of that enhanced professional development has been a result of categorical funds. A particular training that is aligned with those categorical funds is approved by the Department of Education and sort of runs through that whole process in regards to the research base. There are other ways to gather that information in regards to what training is taking place in schools. Clark and Washoe probably have much more capacity to deliver their own professional development. The majority of professional development taking place in schools is coming through RPDP or coming through ESSA based categorical funding that has been approved by the State Department of Education.

Dena Durish added that in the past, according to Section 31.5, the Board of Trustees of each district would only submit a report that included the RPDP training on or before December 1st of each year on a form prescribed by the Department. That would be by December 1st, 2018 for the 17-18 school year. A report concerning professional development training offered by the school district goes to the State; COPS LCE. It also states "The State Board shall prescribe by regulation the contents of the report." This is the current law. This is Recommendation #4a which is aligned with NRS 391A.205.

Member Husson stated there is a need statewide to have better information about what is happening in the schools and districts around professional development. There needs to be an understanding of what is being provided if recommendations are to be made on what should be provided. If we are to be asked to play a role in determining whether standards are good standards and if they are being followed, then it's good for everyone to have the context and this discussion has to happen. Dena Durish stated that if you wanted to proceed with the legislature in the upcoming session you could propose that this body be added to that group. Because if you look there, it says on or before December 1st the Board of Trustees will submit on the form prescribed by the Department. Member Husson stated he's not saying that this body needs to have more authority, he just wants to clarify their role, and more importantly ensure that what we are trying to accomplish as a state is actually getting accomplished.

Member Grossman would like to know if there is someone in the Department of Education who is arrogating all the professional development across the state? Dena Durish referred the Council to Recommendation #11 and stated that the recommendations from this group, as well as the AB474 committee, found that nobody could desegregate what professional development was given or what funding source was used to provide each training. It was found that districts and the State don't have a common definition of budgets or professional development. In answer to Aaron Grossman's question, No, not yet; but in alignment with Recommendation #11, we are working towards that. Dena Durish described a new online management system is being worked on for federal and state grants and the hope would be throughout FY19, NDE would work with districts to implement it. Dena stated that in theory Recommendation #11 would be tied to #4a which would then demonstrate where that professional development comes from, what type of professional development it is, and how the funding is channeled.

Recommendation #4b. The AB474 Task Force recommended that once the Department has created the report structure that would be in #4a and #11, Clark County School District would use a pilot program to then look at school site-level budget tracking regarding those business rules. The results should be reported to SBE as appropriate to the study. Dena Durish made

clear that the legislature did not recommend this. This was a recommendation of the report and there was no legislative action that was taken on this section that requires Clark County to do a pilot program. This is not currently in law. When the restructuring is done, there is no requirement, it is just a suggestion. Member Husson wanted to know more about the structure being put in place. What is the timeline? What will it mean for a school specifically? Dena stated it will primarily impact districts. This year a consolidated application process is being looked at. A district would determine what their needs are and then use the consolidated application to find the appropriate funding to meet those needs. This might prevent an ineffective use of funds from one source when another source would have been more appropriate.

Member Husson stated that it sounded like a front end process but asked if this going to be used on the back end to report where the funds were spent or that somehow that would inform those reports? Dena answered yes, it is not designed as a reporting structure, but it would help that. Dena explained the Final Financial Report would demonstrate how the funds were spent. In order to do that you would need to know what people were doing with their time and not what we applied for. Dena stated going to the districts and finding out what was spent on professional development was one of the challenges. Member Husson asked if we are developing a system that allows the districts to allocate time for an individual for different line items so they could report to us and we could then know this person spent so many hours providing professional development and so many hours on classroom instruction. Dena answered that it wouldn't be drilled down to that extent. If a person was, for example 50% general funded and 50% Title II A funded, what we would want to see is of that 50% of their time during the year what did they do that was spent with allowable Title II A funds. Member Wendi Hawk stated that it does need to be broken down if funds are being used for different staffing. It does need to be reported separately. It has not been done, but there is a reporting site to do that. Dena Durish stated this is not statewide, but that would be a great question for Clark County School District. It is her understanding their new capital management system that was funded by the legislature is, in theory, supposed to do some of the things you are referencing to demonstrate staffing.

Recommendation #5a. The SB474 Task Force indicated a couple different areas where they wanted the Commission on Professional Standards (COPS) to revisit licensure requirements. One was renewal in general for all educators, the second was related to Administrator licensure. Recommendations #5a and #5b are related to the licensure renewal process for everyone and Recommendation #6 is related to Administrators. Stakeholder work groups have met with Jason Dietrich (Director of Licensure), who facilitated those work groups. They've included educator associations, community groups, districts; both on the HR side as well as professional development groups. They submitted suggestions to COPS at the April 18th meeting. R103 and R104 have been developed. COPS had a workshop on that and what those requirements would be and they are pending once the regulation language comes back and then there would be a public hearing for that. Dena Durish stated Recommendation #5 meets the recommendations of this group and feedback from the community to get rid of the 6 credits for renewal. The new process would allow educators to submit 15 hours of job-embedded professional development attended during each academic year. The renewal process would become more of a professional growth process tied to the actual needs of teachers and administrators. With the new licensure system, there would be a way to integrate, update, and validate the professional development that was occurring each year. The educator would then get credit for the professional development taken.

Member Husson had a question regarding Recommendation #5b and if the provider approval should be contemplated rather than the current method of approving individual courses. Member Husson asked if there is a provider approval process now or will there be once this is enacted. Member Husson was asking because one of the recommendations they were going to make for Recommendation #19 is that something like that happen. Dena answered that it is the opposite of that. Currently NAC 391.075 says that the department and COPS shall approve every single course. The department would say the provider is approved and the districts would be responsible for determining if the courses they provide meet their needs. There is nothing in the law that districts determine whether it's effective or not. It's whether or not the teacher taking the

course says it meets their needs. It could be at the direction of the person's supervisor to go take an approved coursework from an approved provider and then submit that at the end of the year for the license. Member Husson asked what the standard is for an approved provider. Dena answered that they are meeting the professional development standards and that they are using the things outlined in ESSA and that they are using Nevada Contents standards.

Chair Zander stated that a couple of members, Hawk and Brockett, will need to be leaving early. If they leave, then quorum will not be attained. This topic will be put on pause for a future date to continue with the rest of the agenda items.

7. Plan for Use of Administrative Training FY19 Funds *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

Based on requests made by the regional RPDP Directors and Governing Boards, previous Council actions included approval of equal distribution of one-third of FY18 \$100,000 administrative training funds to be allocated to each of the RPDPs. Members will hear updates regarding the implementation of preliminary FY18 budgets, and possible action may include the approval of amended budgets, with remaining funds reallocated to other regions.

Chair Zander looked over the Powerpoint slide and stated the administrative funds should be handled by the state rather than individual superintendents at the RPDP levels. Chair Zander spoke with the majority of superintendents and found there is no issue with that. The superintendents and Pat even offered that Clark would be willing to put together a statewide PD if the Department of Education would want to engage in a process or Clark can drive that PD. Chair Zander is unsure if it is an action item, but wanted to say that superintendents are comfortable with that.

Dena- See material power point slide. KellyLynn Charles put together a Powerpoint slide based on the \$100,000 money that has been allocated for the current year FY18. During the last meeting it was approved that one of the RPDPs would continue with their anticipated 33-33-33 and change dollar amount. The other district would reduce their budget in the FY funding and the third would increase theirs. All those were submitted previously so no action for FY18 is needed. This was just a reminder for FY19. Item number 2 on the slide is what the funds are to be use for. The Superintendents talk to the RPDPs, the RPDPs speak to their governing boards, and then the superintendent representatives would come to this board and say what they want to spend the \$100,000 on. Future meetings are tentatively scheduled and will be sent out soon and then at the future meeting the three superintendents can say if they want to approve the \$100,000 admin budget for FY19. Member Hawk commented wanted clarification that they are supposed to come to the board with a grant proposal. Dena stated that is correct. They are to come with a proposed budget. Chair Zander believes this will be more effective since each RPDP distributes the money differently. KellyLynn will plan out dates and see if that will be the first meeting after the new members start or whether it is the second meeting, but it will also depend on when the districts can get together.

8. FY18 Final Budgets and Approval of FY19 Budgets *(Information/Discussion/Possible Action)*

During the last meeting it was discussed whether funds could be rolled over from FY18 to FY19. The answer to that is yes. It applies to not only the \$100,000 admin fund, but also to the RPDP budget. The difference is, in the past, the State had allocated one big lump sum and RPDPs would use that and at the end of the year say what needed to be carried over. That process has been updated, and now goes through us, and now every grant goes through a reimbursement process. RPDPs then submit request for funds once they have spent that money. The difference is that now the money will show if it has not been spent. It will still be sitting in an account. Even though the law says that money can be carried over, what we don't want to happen is to have LCB look at the money and notice that not all the money has been spent and then they would take it back and not give it in the next biennium (which would be FY20-21) because they use base-level funding. There was a meeting with the RPDP folks and Sondra from the NDE staff and looked at how to do that. We can do what's called a maintenance unit. Dena Durish stated NWRPDP is anticipating a carryover of \$10,000.00. This amount would then carryover to their

new FY19 budget amended and it would say this is how the money will now be spent. KellyLynn stated that SNRPDP also submitted their addendum, \$23,770 for estimated carryover. NNRDPDP submitted \$31,700 estimated carryover funds. The three RPDPs also submitted their budget enhancement. This group would be approving all three RPDPs to carryover those funds into FY19 and to request a maintenance unit to maintain that same money be then requested for the next year moving forward.

Motion Member Hawk motions to approve the amended budgets and the motion to approve the carryover for the maintenance.

Motion 2nd by Member Brocket.

Motion carries at 11:24 AM.

9. Projected FY20-FY21 Budgets (*Information/Discussion*) Jeff Zander, Chair

Dena explains that NDE requires that FY20-FY21 budgets be submitted now and in the folder the RPDPs have submitted their projected budgets. They have also submitted a **FY20-21 budget enhancement** for the combined groups for all three of them. The projected budgets will need to be approved for the base amounts that haven't been issued this year and next year. The group has discussed a lot about the cost of salaries and that is a challenge because many of the teachers and administrators that have worked for this group are on district pay scales. When districts give their teachers a raise, the RPDP teachers that are working for them do not get additional money from the districts. They get the same money they have gotten the year before and the year before that. Three RPDPs have submitted a joint budget enhancement concept request. This would go to Superintendent Canavero and then to be reviewed and forwarded to the Governor's budget to determine if they would like to recommend that. It was in the amount of \$298,000 to cover each regional RPDP raises. The consequence if it is not approved, the RPDPs would then have to decrease funding for substitutes or training for staff or reduce staff because they would not be able to afford them. The request is a 2% increase to the overall budget.

Motion Approval of estimated budgets of projected FY20-21 budgets with recommended enhancement.

Member Brocket made motion to approve the FY20-21 budgets with the enhancement.

Member Hawks 2nd the motion.

Motion carries at 11:28 AM

For the record it is no longer an official meeting since quorum has been lost. Remaining items do not require voting. They are solely informational items.

Member Hawk left meeting early around 11:30 AM.

Member Husson stated the rest of the recommendations do not need to go over in this forum. They can be brought back up at a future meeting or Dena can be called to go over them, if other members agree. Chair Zander believes it is probably a good idea to go over the rest of the recommendations at the next meeting when the three new superintendents will be present. Possible agenda item to go over other items, NEPF recommendations, funding of GTLF, items 7-10.

Question from Aaron Grossman in Carson City- does this body have the power to assist with navigating any issues that arise with vendors as they come into districts? Dena states she thinks the answer is probably no. The statutory responsibilities of the RPDP Council are related to the overlap of where Districts and RPDPs occur. Member Grossman clarifies his question. Dena states, no. We have no relationships over vendors. Dena clarifies stating in the example, the PD would fall into the District's needs assessment, and the District would determine whether the vendor met their needs.

10. Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items (*Information/Discussion*)

A Doodle Poll went out. The link will be sent out again to include the new members to determine the dates of the next meeting.

11. Public Comment #2

No public comment in Carson.

Public comment in Las Vegas - Sarah Negrete on behalf of Kirsten Gleisner and Chelli

Smith: Thank you to Jeff Zander for being the Chair for the past two years. We appreciate his leadership, guidance, and support and will miss him. Happy retirement.

12. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 11:38 AM.